

March 8, 2001

F:\USER\PTHOMAS\nataconfmin201.wpd

## **U.S. Environmental Protection Agency**

### **Science Advisory Board Executive Committee**

### **National-Scale Air Toxics Assessment (NATA) Review Panel**

Summary Minutes of Public Conference Call Meeting

February 21, 2001

---

**Committee:** National-Scale Air Toxics Assessment (NATA) Review Panel of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Science Advisory Board (SAB) Executive Committee. (See Roster - Attachment A.)

**Date and Time:** Wednesday, February 21, 2001, 11:00 am - 1:00 pm Eastern Time (See Federal Register Notice - Attachment B).

**Location:** (e.g., Science Advisory Board Conference Room, AR6013 North, US EPA, 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20460)

**Purpose:** To provide Panel Members with the opportunity to clarify the Charge questions, request any supplemental materials from the Agency, ask questions on materials already received from the Agency, and discuss preparations for a public meeting of the NATA Review Panel on March 20-21, 2001 in Durham, NC. This is a planning conference call, and the NATA Review Panel was not accepting oral or written public comments at the conference call, since this is an information-gathering meeting. Public comments will be accepted at the meeting on March 20-21, 2001 (see Federal Register Notice - Attachment B and Feb 8, 2001 Charge - Attachment E. (See also Meeting Agenda - Attachment C.)

**Attendees:** SAB NATA Review Panel Members and Consultants (M/C) present via conference hookup included the following: Drs. Small, Bartell, Brown, Chien, Gentile, Georgopoulos, Greer, Henry, Liu, Mauderly, Milford, and Petersen - all current members were present, except for Drs. Middleton (on Capital Hill that day), and Dr. Anderson (a schedule conflict) - see Attachment A);

Present in the SAB Conference Room AR6013 North were the following: Dr. K. Jack Kooyoomjian (NATA Designated Federal Officer - SAB Staff) and Mr. Robert A. Flaak (FACA Specialist and Team Leader - SAB Staff); Ms. Jeneva Craig, Keith Mason, Mr. Carl Mazza, Mr. Thomas Hawkins, OAR, US EPA. Members of the public present included: Mr. Paul Dugard of the Halogenated Solvents Industry Association (HSIA), Mr. Kyle Isakower, American Petroleum Institute (API), and Mr. Steve Gibb, Risk Policy Report.

Present via conference call hook-up from OAQPS-RTP, NC include the following: John Bachmann, Doug Bell, Alison Davis, Fred Dimmick, Ted Palma, Anne Pope, Roy Smith, Madeline Strum, Joe Tikvart, Joe Touma, Amy Vasu, and Ellen Wildermann. Also present via conference call hook-up included: Marion Herz and Rich Cook, US EPA, Office of Transportation and Air Quality, and Ms. Paulene Johnson, US EPA, and Ms. Mary Ann Hers, OAR's Office of Transportation and Air Quality.

Members from the public who were on the conference call hook-up include the following: Ms. Kathy Barton duPont, Mr. Bill Bonner, International Truck & Equipment Assoc., Mr. Renu Chakrabarty of the West Virginia Office of Air Quality, Mr. Charles Elkins of the Residual Risk Coalition, Mr. Leonard Levin of the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI), Mr. Elliott Milhollin, Latham & Watkins, Ms. Sara D. Schotland of Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton (representing the Ethylene Oxide Council), Ms. Lisa Silva, State of Colorado, Mr. Jack Sipple, Environmental Scientist, Airshed Assessment &

Improvement Program, Delaware Department of Natural Resources & Environmental Control.

27 conference lines were made available, and 27 lines were used during this conference call.

(See Meeting Sign-In Sheets and attached messages from other Attendees - Attachment D.)

**Meeting Summary:**

The meeting followed the issues and general timing as presented in the meeting Agenda, except where otherwise noted (see Meeting Agenda - Attachment C). Since the NATA Review Panel will not be accepting oral or written public comments at this information-gathering conference call, those written comments received up to this date will be provided to the NATA Review Panel as a part of the March 20 & 21, 2001 comments.

Welcome and Introductions - Dr. Mitchell Small, Chairman, opened the meeting at 11:04 a.m. welcoming the members and consultants (M/C) and the various participants (Roster, Attachment A), and reviewed the meeting agenda (Attachment C). \_ No disclosures by SAB NATA Review Panel M/C occurred at this information-gathering meeting, since the disclosures will be a part of the meeting on March 20 & 21, 2001.

Dr. K. Jack Kooyoomjian, Designated Federal Officer for the NATA Review Panel, reviewed the materials which had been provided to the Panelists (sss Attachments I, J & K) and noted that a complete set of materials was available at the meeting for reference purposes. He reminded panelists that contacts with the Agency or public during the Committee deliberative phase (i.e., prior to production of a consensus draft report) should involve the DFO to avoid the perception of undue influence, and that all materials should be sent to the NATA Panelists through the DFO . He outlined the process and suggested timeline for completing a final report to be sent to the Administrator, including the production of a public draft, and the review and approval process of the SAB's Executive Committee.

Discussion of Committee's Advisory (Review) of NATA:

At approximately 11:20 am, Mr. Roy Smith of the US EPA/OAQPS gave an overview presentation (Attachment H). The SAB staff provided hard copies to all participants in the SAB Conference Room. The NATA Review Panel and the other participants dialed up the presentation (a 15-page briefing package) on the web URL site for the NATA slides during the conference call (the site is <http://www.epa.gov/ttn/uatw/sab/sabrev.html>). Mr. Roy Smith outlined the main principles and various components of the NATA program, including initiatives to focus on multimedia and cumulative risks, educational outreach activities, and various technical support activities. He highlighted the emissions inventories, the monitoring network, the air quality exposure and risk modeling as well as the research efforts and assessment tools. Of interest to the NATA Review Panel were the national, regional urban and local-scale assessments and whether the monitoring within 50 miles of sites can actually be utilized and projected to the national-scale framework. There were more detailed discussions on the scope of the National-Scale Assessment process, as well as discussions on the inhalation and chronic exposures, the 1996 Emissions Data, exclusion of the indoor sources, the focus on average exposures, the census-tract level calculations, as well as the county-level and higher data sources. Discussion focused on recognizing the important limitations of the National-Scale Assessment, and how EPA will use such information.

After the presentation by Mr. Roy Smith, Dr. Small sought questions from the NATA Review Panel pertaining to the charge. Most of the panelists commented that they are going over the review materials, including the Appendices and that the presentation by Roy Smith was very helpful. Issues that got raised are summarized as follows:

1) PEER REVIEWS: It would be nice to get summaries of the findings of the PEER reviews, especially since we are being asked to look at the bigger picture (i.e., the integration and application of the models and data). The NATA Panelists thought that a very brief presentation on the PEER review aspects might be helpful at the March 20<sup>th</sup> meeting, with the documentation available for those who wish to pursue this issue. The OAQPS staff may prepare a packet of information on this topical area of PEER review in advance of the meeting to share with the NATA Review Panel.

Some of the NATA Panelists thought that it would be very useful if the OAQPS staff could relay additional information specifically on charge question #2 regarding geographic aggregation of ambient and exposure concentrations generated by ASPEN and HAPEM4 models and comparisons with ambient predictions with ambient monitoring data. It was thought that any additional information would be helpful relating what was accomplished with regard to the PEER review process.

ACTION: It was agreed that Ms. Amy Vasu will provide the summary materials on PEER reviews and that Dr. Jack Kooyoomjian will get a packet of PEER review information together from the OAQPS staff for the NATA Review Panel.

2) DIESEL: Diesel has been treated quite differently from the 33 HAPs, and commentary on the differences regarding the risk assessment would be helpful. Recognizing that the states are interested in this issue, the Agency appears to be asking if there is any other approach to place diesel in context with the other 33 HAPs.

3) BACKGROUND: The NATA Review Panelists had difficulty and concerns on what the background effect would be on the data. It was acknowledged by the Agency staff that a small number of pollutants has been observed to have as much as a 25% effect on background. OAQPS staff indicated that they would touch upon the background issue.

4) REQUEST AVAILABILITY OF AND ACCESS TO COMPUTER CODES: It was discussed that the National-Scale projections incorporate sites within a 50-mile radius of the sources, and that this is more conducive to source and regional-scale, and more detailed state-by-state refinements. A discussion followed on the public availability of and access to the computer codes, and the fact that while the codes can be released to the NATA Review Panel and the public, they are not very user-friendly. It was agreed that the code will be publically available, and may be loaded on the OAQPS web site. The reviewers already have the user's guides for the 2 models as Appendices B and E.

The Agency staff is interested in the larger question of the NATA Panel to comment on the reasonableness of the results as well as the methods utilized. Some interest was also expressed by the Panelists to see how well the specific models, such as ASPEN or HAPEM4 might be focusing on down-stream projections and how reasonable the results may look.

5) DEMONSTRATION: A suggestion was made that perhaps the OAQPS staff could set up a demonstration in an evening session while everyone is at the EPA facility in RTP, NC.

6) REVIEWING METHODOLOGIES AND TO COMMENT ON METHODS DEVELOPMENT: A discussion took place on the census tracts, the quantification of cancer and non-cancer assessments, their outputs in Appendices K & L (See Attachment I and the CD-ROM), the summary graphics at the state level, the availability of the data for those who might wish to examine the data. It was observed by the NATA Panelists that the results and the methodologies

are inextricably linked.

7) **UNCERTAINTY ANALYSIS:** The NATA Panelists expressed an interest in being briefed by the Agency staff on their plans for the uncertainty analysis. There is a strong interest by the NATA Panelists to discuss in-depth the regional, national and local-scale assessments. Specifically, a request was made to examine a broader perspective on Agency plans for the uncertainty analysis for next year and beyond, since this appears to be an over-arching question addressed to the SAB beyond the current charge to the NATA Review Panel.

8) **CROSS-BORDER INVENTORY OF EMISSIONS:** An interest was expressed to have the ability to get a better feel for air toxics on the border area.

9) **BUTADIENE:** It was commented that butadiene is such a uniquely important contaminant in terms of risk, and that there are others that have been PEER reviewed for which summary information should be available. It is not intended to debate the science, but to have a summary sheet on this and other important contaminants that might be significant drivers in terms of risk.

10) **RISK COMMUNICATION:** An interest was expressed by some of the Panelists to receive information at the March meeting as to whether EPA has conducted any pre-testing and meetings with various stakeholder and interest groups on risk communication. Since this is a part of Charge question #7, the NATA Chair encouraged everyone to think about this item for dialogue at the March meeting. A request was made from one of the Panelists for information on communication with the states with regard to air toxics.

11) **REQUEST FOR INFORMATION ON HEALTH BENCHMARKS FOR POLLUTANTS:** A request was received from one of the NATA Panelists for information on potency estimates, which IRIS values are under review or have changed recently (e.g., butadiene), so the panelists could see the impact on any changes on the resulting risk values. There was an interest by one of the NATA Panelists in understanding the differences in levels from the 1990 Cumulative Exposure Project effort and this 1996 NATA effort for butadiene and any other toxics whose potency value may have changed.

12) **REQUEST FOR A SHORT BRIEFING ON EPA'S RESEARCH PROGRAM IN THE AREA OF NATA:** A request was made to receive a short briefing and be provided with materials to regarding EPA's research program in the area of air toxics

13) **REQUEST FOR INFORMATION ON CONSENSUS:** A discussion occurred on the process on achieving consensus. Mr. Robert Flaak discussed the process when minority opinions need to be recognized if consensus is not achieved.

14) **CROSS-WALK:** The current cross-walk which ties the charge questions to the review materials, including the Appendices will be updated by the OAQPS Staff and provided to Jack Kooyoomjian for distribution to the NATA Panelists and the interested public.

#### **ACTION ITEMS:**

1. **PEER REVIEWS:**
  - a) The NATA Review Panel would like to receive in summary form the results of the PEER reviews on the models, such as ASPEN and HAPEM4 and underlying constructs,
  - b) Jack Kooyoomjian will work with staff to forward this information to the NATA Review Panel as

soon as it is available

2. DIESEL: It is anticipated that there will be a discussion at the March meeting which examines diesel and how it has been treated as compared to the 33 HAPs. Some commentary on the differences regarding the risk assessment would be helpful. The Agency appears to be asking if there is any other approach to place diesel in context with the other 33 HAPs.
3. BACKGROUND EFFECTS: OAQPS Staff will touch on this issue in the presentations on March 20<sup>th</sup>.
4. AVAILABILITY OF AND ACCESS TO COMPUTER CODES:
  - a) Some of the NATA Review Panelists would like to look at the models and computer codes and wanted to request this as a part of the review process.
  - b) The OAQPS staff will provide the code for HAPEM4, and ASPEN to the extent that there is interest in pursuing this. The OAQPS staff indicated that, while both models can/will be released to the public, they need some explanation, because they are not user-friendly.
  - c) Any additional supporting data, summary graphs, etc. will be provided by the Agency staff and made available upon request as needed for the NATA Review Panel.
5. DEMONSTRATION:
  - a) It was suggested that perhaps the Agency staff could set up an evening session or demonstration on the models during the March public review meeting.
  - b) The OAQPS staff will assess the feasibility of providing a demonstration for the NATA Review Panel and the interested public.
6. OVERVIEW BRIEFING:
  - a) Some of the NATA Review Panelists remarked how useful the overview briefing was by Roy Smith and requested him to repeat this on March 20<sup>th</sup> for those who may not have participated in the February 21<sup>st</sup> conference call.
  - b) The Agency staff agreed to repeat and modify the overview briefing, incorporating the various suggestions for this public conference call.
7. UNCERTAINTY ANALYSIS - REQUEST FOR A BROADER VIEW AND AVAILABILITY TO THE PUBLIC:
  - a) One of the NATA Panelists asked about the status of the Agency's plan for uncertainty and variability analysis and whether that plan would be presented at the SAB review.
  - b) The Agency staff will review the perspective on the uncertainty analysis in its presentation at the March 20<sup>th</sup> public meeting with the NATA Panelists.
8. REQUEST FOR INFORMATION ON HEALTH BENCHMARKS FOR POLLUTANTS:
  - a) A request was received from one of the NATA Panelists for information on potency estimates, which IRIS values are under review or have changed recently (e.g., butadiene), so the panelists could see the impact on any changes on the resulting risk values. There was an interest by one of the NATA Panelists in understanding the differences in levels from the 1990 Cumulative Exposure Project effort and this 1996 NATA effort for butadiene and any other toxics whose potency value may have changed.

9. REQUEST FOR A SHORT BRIEFING ON EPA's RESEARCH PROGRAM IN THIS TOPICAL AREA:
  - a) A request was made to receive a short briefing and be provided with materials to regarding EPA's research program in the area of air toxics
10. RISK COMMUNICATION:
  - a) An interest was expressed by some of the Panelists to receive information at the March meeting as to whether EPA has conducted any pre-testing and meetings with various stakeholder and interest groups on risk communication. Since this is a part of Charge question #7, the NATA Chair encouraged everyone to think about this item for dialogue at the March meeting.
  - b) A request was made from one of the Panelists for information on communication with the states with regard to air toxics.
11. BENEFITS QUESTION ON CAAA SECTION 812 AND CHARGE QUESTION #8:
  - a) A clarification and cautionary note was provided by the Agency staff that Charge question #8 was added later in the process, that the supporting information is not in the current package, and that there will be discussions on this topic to help another part of the Agency in the CAAA Section 812 Prospective Study benefits evaluation process.
12. AIR TOXICS ON BORDER AREAS:
  - a) The NATA Panelists requested some information for air toxics on the border areas, such as with Canada and the US
13. REVIEW PROCESS AND TIME LINE:
  - a) All NATA Review Panelists should provide their written comments to Dr. Mitchell Small and cc Dr. Jack Kooyoomjian, no later than Wednesday, March 14<sup>th</sup> so that an initial compendium of comments can be assembled for review for the March 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> public review meeting.
  - b) It is the intention of the NATA Review Panelists to prepare a second and perhaps third draft on-site at the March 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> public review meeting.
  - c) As a contingency, April 24<sup>th</sup> is being reserved from 11:00 am to 1:00 pm (eastern standard time) for a public conference call to help the NATA Review Panel complete its draft report/advisory.
  - d) It is the intention of the NATA Review Panel to complete the review in April and provide a consensus draft to the SAB's Executive Committee for their review and approval in that time frame.
14. CROSS-WALK:
  - a) The current cross-walk which ties the charge questions to the review materials, including the Appendices will be updated by the OAQPS Staff and provided to Jack Kooyoomjian for distribution to the NATA Panelists and the interested public.
15. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION ITEMS:
  - a) All participants will provide their names, organizational affiliations and e-mail or other information for the record either by FAX or e-mail to the NATA DFO, Dr. K. Jack Kooyoomjian at (FAX: 202-501-0582, e-mail: [kooyoomjian.jack@epa.gov](mailto:kooyoomjian.jack@epa.gov)). (This material may be found in Attachment D).
  - b) All NATA Review Panelists should register for the SAB Discussion DataBase. Jack Kooyoomjian has provided registration information to all the NATA Panelists and will work with those needing assistance.

c) Jack Kooyoomjian and Don Barnes are working on the Agenda for the March 20 & 21 meeting, and this will be provided to the NATA Panelists prior to the meeting, after we have coordinated with the Chair and the Agency staff. A copy of the draft agenda will be posted on the SAB web site prior to the meeting.

**The Committee scheduled its next meeting for:**

Tuesday March 20<sup>th</sup> and Wednesday March 21<sup>st</sup>, 2001 as a continuation of this specific topic. Additionally, a contingency date of April 24<sup>th</sup>, 2001 has been set for a Conference Call to develop a consensus draft, if this is needed.

There being no further business, Dr. Small adjourned the meeting at 11:57 am.

Respectfully Submitted:

Certified as True:

signed 3/7/01

signed 3/8/01

---

K. Jack Kooyoomjian  
Designated Federal Officer  
SAB NATA Review Panel

---

Mitchell Small, Chair  
SAB National-Scale Air Toxics  
Assessments (NATA) Review Panel

### List of Attachments

<u>Attachment</u>	<u>Description</u>
A	NATA Review Panel Roster
B	Federal Register Notice, Vol. 66, Number 29, February 12, 2001, pages 9846-9847
C	Meeting Agenda dated Feb. 20, 2001
D	Meeting Sign-In Sheets and attached messages confirming participation by attendees
E	Charge to the NATA Review Panel (sab-charge2801.wpd)
F	NATA Charge and Proposed Discussants (charge discussants.wpd)
G	Cross-walk for Charge Questions and "NATA National-Scale Air Toxics Assessment for 1996"
H	Overview of EPA's NATA 1996 National-Scale Air Toxics Assessment by Roy L. Smith, US EPA/OAQPS, Presentation to the Science Advisory Board, Feb. 21, 2001 (15 pages)
I	NATA Review Package, dated January 25, 2001
J	Information for Feb. 21, 2001 Conference Call, from Jack Kooyoomjian and Don Barnes to the NATA Review Panel, Feb. 13, 2001
K	SAB Reports for Background on NATA Topic and Charge Questions: EPA-SAB-IHEC-ADV-96-004 EPA-SAB-COUNCIL-ADV-00-001 EPA-SAB-COUNCIL-ADV-00-002 EPA-SAB-COUNCIL-ADV-00-003

(End of record)



